|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity** | | | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-5 Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)** | | | |
| *DEFINITION:*  This indicator measures the total number of farmers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, wild fisheries, aquaculture, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included), individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, etc. that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USG assistance. This includes innovations in efficiency, value-addition, post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest and water management, managerial practices, input supply delivery. Any technology that was first applied in a previous year and that continues to be applied should be included as ‘continuing’. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including, but not limited to, carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies could include:  • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging  • Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;  • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;  • Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices  Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted. In the case where, for example, a farmer applies more than one innovation as a result of USG assistance, they are still only counted once. Also, if more than one farmer in a household is applying new technologies, count all the farmers in the household who apply.  This indicator is to count *individuals* who applied new technologies, whereas indicator #4.5.2-28 is to count firms, associations, or other group entities applying new technologies. | | | |
| *RATIONALE:*  Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the in the agricultural supply change will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity which is the Intermediate Result which this indicator falls under. | | | |
| *UNIT:*  Number | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Duration  --New = This reporting year is the first year the person applied the new technology or management practice  --Continuing = The person first applied the new technology or practice in the previous year and continues to apply it  Sex: Male, Female | | |
| *TYPE:*  Outcome | | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Higher is better | |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing Partners | | | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; only those individuals targeted by USG programs * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Survey of all targeted individuals, Project or association records, farm records * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | | | |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity** | | | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-6 Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (S)** | | | |
| *DEFINITION:*  The number of people who are currently enrolled in or graduated in the current fiscal year from a bachelor’s, master’s or Ph.D. program or are currently participating in or have completed in the current fiscal year a long term (degree-seeking) advanced training program such as a fellowship program or a post-doctoral studies program. An example is a USDA Borlaug Leadership Enhancement Program..  A person completing one long term training program in the fiscal year and currently participating in another long term training program should be counted only once.  Agricultural productivity includes cultured and natural production (farmers, fishers, ranchers). Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture, but do not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead.  This indicator is to count *individuals* receiving training, for which the outcome (individuals applying new practices), should be reported under #4.5.2-5. | | | |
| *RATIONALE:*  Measures enhanced human capacity for policy formulation and implementation which is key to transformational development. | | | |
| *UNIT:*  Number | | | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Sex: Male, Female |
| *TYPE:*  Output | | | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Higher is better |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing Partners will review program documents to track individuals in long-term training programs. | | | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; individuals targeted by USG program * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program training records * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity** | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-7 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (RiA) (WOG)** | |
| *DEFINITION:*  The number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills should be counted. This includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of new technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc, and training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management. In-country and off-shore training are included. Include training on climate risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments, as it relates to agriculture. Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities. An example is a USDA Cochran Fellow.  Training should include food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change resilience, but should not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9-1 instead.  This indicator is to count *individuals* receiving training, for which the outcome, i.e. individuals applying new practices, should be reported under #4.5.2-5. | |
| *RATIONALE:*  Measures enhanced human capacity for increased agriculture productivity, improved food security, policy formulation and/or implementation, which is key to transformational development. | |
| *UNIT:*  Number | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Type of individual:  -Producers (farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers, etc.)  -People in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers)  -People in private sector firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers)  -People in civil society (e.g. NGOs, CBOs, CSOs, research and academic organizations)  *Note: While producers are included under MSMEs under indicators 4.5.2-30 and 4.5.2-37, only count them under the Producers and not the Private Sector Firms disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double-counting.*  Sex: Male, Female |
| *TYPE:*  Output | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Higher is better |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing partners | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; individuals targeted by USG program * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Program training records * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity** | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-11 Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)** | |
| *DEFINITION:*  Total number of private enterprises, producers’ associations, cooperatives, producers organizations, fishing associations, water users associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations, including those focused on natural resource management, that received USG assistance related to food security during the reporting year. This assistance includes support that aims at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. “Organizations assisted” should only include those organizations for which implementing partners have made a targeted effort to build their capacity or enhance their organizational functions.  In the case of training or assistance to farmer’s association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity. | |
| *RATIONALE:*  Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity. | |
| *UNIT:*  Number | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types)  New/Continuing:  --New = the entity is receiving USG assistance for the first time during the reporting year  --Continuing = the entity received USG assistance in the previous year and continues to receive it in the reporting year  *System note: In the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS), you will enter the number of each type of organization receiving assistance for your projects, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator across all projects.* |
| *TYPE:*  Output | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Higher is better |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing partners | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records of training and various USG assistance for these specific types of organizations/associations * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Capacity**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity** | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-27 Number of members of producer organizations and community based organizations receiving USG assistance (S)** | |
| *DEFINITION:*  A producer organization in this context is any grouping of people involved in agriculture including input suppliers, transporters, farmers, fishers, ranchers, processors, etc. that is organized around adding value to agricultural production. A community based organization (CBO) in this context is simply an organization involved in supporting any type of agricultural activity (including post-harvest transformation) and is based in a community and made up principally of individuals from the local community. Producer associations are often CBOs, but are reported as a distinct disaggregate USG assistance can include any help provided to either type of organization to expand coverage, services provided, information, etc. Some examples are organizational capacity building, training, other technical assistance, provision of supplies and materials, encouragement and motivation for improvements, etc. The indicator includes any person within the agricultural value chain who is a member of one of these organizations and thus directly received USG assistance.  This indicator counts the number of members within these types of organizations which receive assistance. It does not count the number of institutions, the amount of the assistance or the change in the value of agricultural commodities. Note that individuals counted under this indicator would also be part of households counted in the total number under indicator #4.5.2-13 (number of rural households benefiting), as applicable. | |
| *RATIONALE:*  Helping the members of these institutions directly strengthens those organizations, which in turn will assist in improving the overall value of production in the agricultural value chain, improving productivity and contributing to a reduction in poverty, as most of the poor are in rural areas either as farmers, farm workers or workers in rural enterprises. | |
| *UNIT:*  Number | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Type of organization: Producer organization, Non-producer-organization CBO  Sex: Male, Female |
| *TYPE:*  Output | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Higher is better |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing partners | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; those affected by USG project scope * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Project records * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | |

|  |
| --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2: Agricultural Sector Productivity**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1 Improved Agricultural Productivity / Sub IR 1.1 Enhanced human and institutional capacity development for increased sustainable agriculture sector productivity** |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-28 Number of private enterprises, producers organizations, water users associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (RiA) (WOG)** |
| DEFINITION:  Total number of private enterprises (processors, input dealers, storage and transport companies) producer associations, cooperatives, water users associations, fishing associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), including those focused on natural resource management, that applied new technologies or management practices in areas including management (financial, planning, human resources), member services, procurement, technical innovations (processing, storage), quality control, marketing, etc. as a result of USG assistance in this reporting year. Only count the entity once per reporting year, even if multiple technologies or management practices are applied. Any groups applying a technology that was first applied in a previous year and continues to be applied in the reporting year should be included under “Continuing.” However, if they added a new technology or practice during the reporting year to the ones they continued to apply from previous year(s), they would be counted as “New.” No organization should be counted under both New and Continuing. .  Application of a new technology or management practice by the enterprise, association, cooperative or CBO is counted as one and not as applied by the number in their employees and/or membership. For example, when a farmer association incorporates new corn storage innovations as a part of member services, the application is counted as one association and not multiplied by the number of farmer-members.  Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include but are not limited to:  • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging  • Biological: New germ plasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;  • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides sustainably and environmentally applied, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiencies;  • Management and cultural practices: sustainable water management; practices; sustainable land management practices; sustainable fishing practices; Information technology, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity and/or resiliency to climate change. IPM, ISFM, and PHH as related to agriculture should all be included as improved technologies or management practices. |
| RATIONALE:  Tracks private sector and civil society behavior change to increase agricultural sector productivity. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *UNIT:*  Number | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Type of organization (see indicator title for principal types)  Duration: New, Continuing  --New = entity applied a targeted new technology/management practice for the first time during the reporting year  --Continuing = entity applied new technology(ies)/practice(s) in a previous year and continues to apply in the reporting year |
| *TYPE:*  *Outcome* | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  *Higher is better* |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing partners | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; within the scope of the USG project * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation, project records, etc. * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.1: Agricultural Enabling Environment**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 1: Improved Agriculture Productivity / Sub IR 1.3: Improved Agricultural Policy Environment** | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.1-24 Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case:**  **Stage 1: Analyzed**  **Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation**  **Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decree**  **Stage 4: Passed/approved**  **Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (S)** | |
| *DEFINITION:*  Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that:  Stage 1: …underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures).  Stage 2: …underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.  Stage 3: … underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decree to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)  Stage 4: …underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decree) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).  Stage 5: …completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).  Please count the highest stage completed during the reporting year. | |
| *RATIONALE:*  The indicator measures the number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for agriculture whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. This indicator is easily aggregated upward from all operating units. | |
| *UNIT:*  Number  *\*\*FTF System Note\*\*: Please enter the name of the* policy / regulation / administrative procedure *and then select its sector and stage in order to track movement through the stages. The FTF system will automatically calculate the number of policies at each stage.* | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Sector:   * Inputs (e.g. seed, fertilizer) * Outputs (e.g. rice, maize) * Macroeconomic (e.g. exchange rate) * Agricultural sector-wide (e.g. wage rate for agricultural labor) * Research, extension, information, and other public service * Food security/vulnerable (e.g. safety net) * Climate change adaptation or natural resource management (NRM) (agriculture-related)   Stage  1: Analyzed  2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation  3: Presented for legislation/decree  4: Passed/approved  5: Passed for which implementation has begun |
| *TYPE:*  Stages 1 & 2 = Output  Stages 3, 4, & 5 = Outcome | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Because this indicator tracks individual policies through the disaggregated stages, one should see actuals for each stage change over time in certain ways. One should expect the value of disaggregates measuring the earlier stages to decline and the disaggregates measuring the later stages of progress to increase as the enabling environment is strengthened (i.e., move from analysis to adoption and implementation of reforms) |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing Partners | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*  *System Note: In the FTF Monitoring System (FTFMS), the policy title/name should be entered and then associated with one of the five stages listed above, as well as labeled for the sector it addresses. The system* ***will automatically aggregate*** *the total number of policies at each stage of development and in each sector.*  Implementing Partners should clearly describe each policy/regulation in the title/description in the system as to avoid double counting by multiple partners operating in a given country. Missions should consider assigning this indicator to the particular partner best positioned to track this indicator.   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project-level; policies specifically addressed with USG assistance * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation and analysis of host government legal status of the various policies being addressed * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY**  **INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – IR 3: Increased investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities** | |
| **INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FTF assistance (S)** | |
| *DEFINITION:*  Number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed during the reporting year due to FTF intervention (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). Private partnerships can by long or short in duration (length is not a criteria for measurement). Partnerships with multiple partners should only be counted once. A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. Please count both Global Development Alliance (GDA) partnerships and non-GDA partnerships for this indicator. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. USAID must be one of the public partners. USAID is almost always represented in the partnership by its implementing partner. For-profit enterprises and NGOs are considered private. A public entity can be national or sub-national government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner. It could include state enterprises which are non-profit. A private entity can be a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully).  A mission or a project may form more than one partnership with the same entity, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. Public-private partnerships counted should be only those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year should not be included.   * An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation. * A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers, develop improved nutritional products, increase support for nutrition service delivery, etc.   NOTE: Each partnership’s formation should only be reported once in order to add the total number of partnerships across years. | |
| *RATIONALE:*  The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will help achieve IR3 which then contributes to the Key Objective of agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, but because the focus of project work is on the vulnerable (women, children and the poor) there will be a reduction in poverty. | |
| *UNIT:*  Number  *System note: In the FTFMS, you will enter the name of the partnership, label it for its type, and the system will aggregate the total number for this indicator.* | *DISAGGREGATE BY:*  Partnership focus (refer to the ***primary focus*** of the partnership):  -agricultural production  -agricultural post-harvest transformation  -nutrition  -other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships)  -multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership) |
| *TYPE:*  Output | *DIRECTION OF CHANGE:*  Higher is better |
| *DATA SOURCE:*  Implementing partner | |
| *MEASUREMENT NOTES:*   * LEVEL of COLLECTION: Project level; attributable to USG investment * WHO COLLECTS DATA FOR THIS INDICATOR: Implementing partners * HOW SHOULD IT BE COLLECTED: Observation and records of partnerships created * FREQUENCY of COLLECTION: Annually reported | |